

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 5-20 are currently pending in the above-referenced patent application. Claims 3-4 have been canceled, claims 5, 6 and 8 have been amended, and claims 9-20 have been newly added by way of the present Amendment. Further, Figures 1-4, the title, and page 4 of the specification have been amended by way of the present Amendment.

In the Office Action: Figures 1-4 were objected to per MPEP § 608.02(g). The drawings were objected under 37 CFR § 1.83(a). The title of the invention was objected to as being not descriptive. The specification was objected to on page 4, line 14 for a typographical error. Claim 6 was objected to because of informalities. Claims 1, 2 and 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

In response to the objection to Figures 1-4 per MPEP § 608.02(g), the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Figures 1-4 have been amended to include a label “conventional art”, which is consistent with the disclosure in the specification. Conventional art is different from prior art.

In our response to the objections to the drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83(a), the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. The Action states on page 2 that “[t]he drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the bridge interval in the discharge cell corresponding to the B fluorescent layer is larger than that in the discharge cell corresponding to the R fluorescent layer must be shown or the

feature(s) canceled from the claim 5.” Claim 5 now recites that “an interval between bridges in the discharge cell corresponding to the B fluorescent layer is larger than an interval between bridges in the discharge cell corresponding to the R fluorescent layer.” This recited feature is shown in exemplary Figure 6 by the exemplary implementation of bridges 21' and 21". Accordingly, the drawings do show every feature of the invention specified in claim 5.

In response to the objection to the title as not being descriptive, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. The title of the invention has been amended to read “Plasma Display Panel With Improved Brightness and Color Purity”.

In response to the objection to the specification on page 4, line 14, for typographical error, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. On page 4, line 14, the recitation of “fluorescent layer 23” has been amended to “fluorescent layer 24”.

In response to the objection of claim 6 for informalities, the Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. The recitation of claim 6 “one of claims 1” has been amended to read “claim 1”.

In response to the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. The Office Action states on page 3 that “[t]he recitation of ‘bridge interval’ found in claims 1, 5 and 8 is not clearly defined in the specification. . .” However, claims 1, 2 and 6 do not recite “bridge interval”.

In response to the rejection of claims 5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. As a result of an amendment to claim 5, these claims now recite “an interval between bridges in the discharge cell corresponding to the B fluorescent layer is larger than an interval between bridges in the discharge cell corresponding to the R fluorescent layer.” The Applicants respectfully submit that these recitations are sufficiently disclosed exemplary Figure 6 in the accompanying exemplary disclosure on pages 11 and 12 of the specification.

In response to the rejection of claims 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. Claim 8 has been amended to recite “an interval between bridges in the discharge cell corresponding to the R fluorescent layer is larger than an interval between bridges in the discharge cell corresponding to the B fluorescent layer”. The Applicants respectfully submit that this recitation is adequately disclosed in Figure 6 and accompanying exemplary disclosure in the specification on pages 11 and 12.

The Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration of newly added claims 9-13. These claims recite an apparatus comprising a first set of discharge cells, a second set of discharge cells, and a third set of discharge cells. The first set of discharge cells, the second set of discharge cells, and the third set of discharge cells are separated by barriers. Each cell of the first set of discharge cells is separated from another adjacent cell of the first set of discharge cells by bridges. Each cell of the second set of discharge cells is

contiguous with another adjacent cell of the second set of discharge cells. Each cell of the third set of discharge cells contiguous with another adjacent cell of the third set of discharge cells.

The Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration of newly added claims 14-20. These claims recite an apparatus comprising a first set of discharge cells, a second set of discharge cells, and a third set of discharge cells. The first set of discharge cells, the second set of discharge cells, and the third set of discharge cells are separated by barriers. Each cell of the first set of discharge cells is separated from another adjacent cell of the first set of discharge cells by bridges. Each cell of the second set of discharge cells is separated from another adjacent cell of the second set of discharge cells by bridges. Each cell of the third set of discharge cells is contiguous with another adjacent cell of the third set of discharge cells. The surface area of each cell of the first set of discharge cells is larger than the surface area of each cell of the second set of discharge cells.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, Daniel H. Sherr, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Daniel H. Sherr
Registration No. 46,425

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200
703 502-9440 DYK/DHS:ecf
Date: May 16, 2003